

University of Groningen

Sibawaih's Treatment of the D stem

Leemhuis, F.

Published in:
Journal of Semitic Studies

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2008

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Leemhuis, F. (2008). Sibawaih's Treatment of the D stem. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 18, 238-256.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

By F. LEEMHUIS

In Semitic grammar the D stem¹ is traditionally said to have (at least primarily) an intensive meaning.² However in some branches of semitics this traditional view has been challenged. One of the main problems was how to relate this assumed primary intensive meaning with the causative, denominative or declarative, etc., meanings, which the D stem also, and rather conspicuously, appeared to have. "The causative-factitive force of the form is customarily said to be an outgrowth of the intensive force. But nobody has ever been able to demonstrate in a satisfactory manner how this development should have been possible."³ But apart from this difficulty,⁴ a serious objection could be raised

¹ The Ungnad system of denoting verbal stems will be used in this article: G = Grundstamm, basic stem, D = Dopplungsstamm, stem with doubled second radical, etc. See A. Ungnad, "Die Bezeichnung der Verbalstämme im Semitischen", *O.L.Z.* IX (1906), 45–7. In this paper the symbol H is used to denote the stem with prefixed *hamza*. The use of the symbol C (for causative) as in J. MacDonald, "The Arabic derived verb themes: a study in form and meaning", *Isl. Quarterly* VII (1963), 100 ff., should not be preferred, because the Ungnad symbols serve best when used as a shorthand for morphological facts.

² See, for example, C. Brockelmann, *G.V.G.* I (Berlin, 1908), 508: "Durch Verdoppelung des 2. Radikals entsteht der Intensivstamm... Die durch den Stamm ausgedrückte Intensität kann sich auf sehr verschiedene Seiten der Tätigkeit beziehen..." It seems, as I was informed by Professor Dr J. H. Hospers, that in Brockelmann's time it was one of the current ideas in linguistic theory that reduplication, and for that matter also gemination (often seen as a kind of simplified reduplication) was, more or less clearly discernibly, "logically" connected with semantic intensification. Cf. K. Brugmann, *Grundriß der vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Strassburg, 1886–93), II, 1 (1889), §6, pp. 11–14, §52, p. 90, and II, 2 (1892), §464, p. 845, and also the second edition II, 1 (1906), §§20 and 21, pp. 44–7. In this light it is not surprising that Brockelmann mentions **qaqtal* and **qatatal* as possible original forms of D.

³ A. Goetze, "The So-called Intensive of the Semitic Languages", *J.A.O.S.* LXII (1942), 3.

⁴ Different scholars have tried to solve this problem by constructing a common denominator, which is, however, necessarily rather vague. Thus e.g. for Arabic, H. Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen* (Leiden, 1895–8), p. 44: "Die zweite Konjugation bedeutet: sich um die von den ersten Konjugation bezeichnete Handlung bemühen, mag die Handlung

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

against the assumption itself that the D stem has an intensive meaning, it being based on *a priori* reasoning and not on an investigation of the linguistic material. One assumption was the belief that Arabic was to be regarded as the most archaic of the Semitic languages and that therefore the opinions of the Arabic grammarians that the D stem has an intensive meaning had to hold true, at least basically, for the other languages. Another was, to quote A. Goetze, that "In the last analysis, this assumption rests on the romantic notion that the doubling of the middle radical which characterizes the pi'el over against the qal, i.e. its intensification, symbolizes a corresponding intensification in the force of the form."¹

Investigation and analysis of textual material have led Assyriologists, who became aware of the mentioned assumptions, to posit a factitive meaning – that is a causative meaning in relation to a state or condition – as the basic meaning of the D stem.² Lately also for Hebrew a similar view has been advocated by E. Jenni,³ who comes to the conclusion that the D stem in biblical Hebrew has a factitive-resultative meaning.⁴

vom Subjekt selbst ausgehen (intensiv) oder von einem andern (kausativ)"; and MacDonald, *op. cit.* p. 105: "...the so-called intensive is in reality an extensive in terms of the quality of the primary action..., *busyng oneself with* the action indicated by the root concept is another form of *extended* action on the part of the agent...", and p. 107: "All told, D is the theme of extension, whether it be on the part of the agent's action (intensive), or whether it be the attitude of the agent to someone else doing the action, or the agent's performance with regard to a quality."

¹ Goetze, *op. cit.* p. 2.

² So Goetze, *op. cit.* pp. 4–6; W. von Soden, *Grundriß der akkadischen Grammatik* (Roma, 1952), pp. 115–17; A. Ungnad and L. Matouš, *Grammatik des Akkadischen* (München 1964⁴), pp. 74–5; and K. K. Riemschneider, *Lehrbuch des Akkadischen* (Leipzig, 1969), p. 77. Cf. also S. Moscati, A. Spitaler, E. Ullendorff and W. von Soden, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1964), 2nd edn. 1969, p. 124, where however it is also stated, probably as a concession to traditional Arabic grammar, that "To this meaning-aspect must be added the denominative one...and the intensive aspect..."

³ E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Pi'el. Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament* (Zürich, 1968). In the introduction (pp. 9–15) a handy synopsis of the inadequacies of the traditional views and of the new insights from Akkadian grammar is given.

⁴ When G is intransitive D is factitive, when G is transitive D is resultative: "Als Bezeichnung der Grundfunktion des Pi'el bei transitiven Grundstämmen wählen wir statt Faktitiv den Ausdruck *Resultativ*, weil der zur transitiven Verbalbedeutung gehörige adjektivische Zustand notwendigerweise ein Endzustand, das Ergebnis der betreffenden Handlung ist" (Jenni, *op. cit.* p. 126).

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

The opinion that the D stem has an intensive meaning was based on the traditions of the native Arabic grammarians,¹ which – also via mediaeval Hebrew grammar – found their way into the European grammars of Semitic languages. Interesting in this respect is that in European grammars of Arabic the opinion is often found that this original meaning of the D stem “agrees with the form in respect of being intensive (لِلْمُبَالَغَةِ) or extensive (لِلتَكْثِيرِ)”.² Even when this agreement of form and meaning is

not explicitly stated, often the intensive meaning is considered to be the original and most important meaning of the D stem.³

Although others are more careful in giving only a list of meanings, the intensive meaning is usually the first mentioned.⁴ The opinion that the D stem has no intensive meaning is very seldom met with.⁵ Just because many scholars, who say that the intensive meaning is the original or first meaning of the D stem, also state that the more usual meaning is a “causative”, one gets the impression that they felt that the D stem had to have primarily an intensive meaning because of the intensified pronunciation of the middle radical. Illuminating is a comment of Fleischer on the passage, where De Sacy in the second edition of his Arabic grammar writes: “Les verbes, à la seconde forme, sont fréquem-

¹ See e.g. Goetze, *op. cit.* p. 1 nn. 2 and 6; Jenni *op. cit.* p. 278.

² W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge, 1896 etc.), I, 31. See also G. H. A. Ewald, *Grammatica critica linguae Arabicae* (Lipsiae, 1831), I, 95, and C. Pellat, *Introduction à l'Arabe moderne* (Paris, 1961), p. 57. Cf. M. Chouémi, *Le verbe dans le Coran* (Paris, 1966), p. 84: “La valeur fondamentale de la IIe forme est l'intensité qui provient du redoublement de la 2e consonne.”

³ E.g. C. Brockelmann and M. Fleischhammer, *Arabische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1962), p. 35; A. A. Ambros, *Einführung in die moderne arabische Schriftsprache* (München, 1969), p. 332.

⁴ So e.g. G. Lecomte, *Grammaire de l'Arabe* (Paris, 1968), p. 28; D. Cowan, *An Introduction to Modern Literary Arabic* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 139; E. Harder and A. Schimmel, *Arabische Sprachlehre* (Heidelberg, 1968), p. 108; W. Fischer, *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch* (Wiesbaden, 1972), p. 87; H. Fleisch, *L'Arabe classique. Esquisse d'une structure linguistique* (Beyrouth, 1956), p. 92 (Beyrouth, 1968²), p. 119; J. A. Haywood and H. M. Nahmad, *A new Arabic grammar of the written language* (London, 1962), p. 153, although on p. 161 the intensive meaning is only the third mentioned; S. A. Hanna, *An elementary manual of contemporary literary Arabic* (Boulder, Colorado, 1964), p. 35; W. B. Bishai, *Concise Grammar of Literary Arabic* (Dubuque, Iowa, 1971), p. 157. Cf. however *The M.E.C.A.S. Grammar of Modern Literary Arabic* (Beirut, 1965), p. 114.

⁵ A. F. L. Beeston, *The Arabic Language Today* (London, 1970), p. 75 n. 1.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

ment synonymes de ceux de la première forme: ils expriment seulement une sorte d'énergie."¹ Certainly this was not enough for Fleischer: "Genauer sprechen darüber Ewald, I. S. 95 und Wright, I. S. 31 §40. Zamahšari, Mufaššal S. 129: Der häufigste Gebrauch der zweiten Form ist der zum Ausdrücke der Vielheit...", etc.²

Though it may be true that most Arab grammarians, and not only the later ones, attributed an intensive meaning to the D stem, it should be remembered that they were not in the first place concerned with a description of the language and how it was used; they were prescribing for their contemporaries the language and how it should be ideally used. Moreover, they became more and more convinced that the Arabic language, as a God-given treasure, was a miracle of logic; the only task of the grammarian was to discover and lay bare the bases of this absolute system and either to refer the facts of the language to these bases or to reject them as improper.³ One such aspect of the "discovery" of the absolute logic of the language was that intensification or repetition of the middle radical had to reflect an intensive or iterative meaning.⁴ In this light, we see how it is often said that D has an extra notion of intensity or frequency when it seems to have the same meaning as H.⁵

This dogmatic approach in explaining the data of the language has had a great influence on the European treatment of Arabic

¹ S. de Sacy, *Grammaire arabe*, 2nd edn, 1 (Paris, 1831), 131.

² H. L. Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften* (Leipzig, 1885), I, 70.

³ See e.g. the preliminaries pp. 1-49 (especially the first chapter) about the methods of the Arab grammarians in Fleisch, *Traité de philologie arabe*, 1 (Beyrouth, 1961).

⁴ So *expressis verbis* Ibn Ġinnī, *al-Ḥaṣā'is* (Cairo 1332/1914), in the باب "ومن ذلك: في الإساس الألفاظ اشباه المعاني أنهم جعلوا تكرير العين في المثال دليلا على تكرير الفعل، فقالوا كسّر، وقطّع، وفتح، وغلّق، وذلك أنهم لما جعلوا الألفاظ دليلا المعاني، فأقوى اللفظ ينبغي أن يقابل به قوة الفعل، والعين أقوى من الفاء واللام، وذلك لأنها واسطة لهما ومنكوفة بهما"

⁵ So Ibn Qutaiba in *Adab al-Kātib* under أبنية الأفعال معاني أبنية الأفعال: وتدخل فَعَّلَتْ: معاني أبنية الأفعال إذا أردت تكثير العمل والمبالغة، ed. M. Grünert (Leiden, 1901), p. 488; ed. M. M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo, 1382/1963⁴), I, p. 354. Cf. also Chouémi, *op. cit.* p. 98, "...la IIe forme garde toujours une nuance d'intensité même quand elle a une valeur factitive. C'est ainsi qu'elle garde sa personnalité par rapport à la IVe forme quand les deux formes sont presque synonymes."

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

grammar, because not only were those native grammars used by the Europeans mostly later ones, but also because of the fact that the scholars who studied Arab grammar were convinced that only by way of the later grammarians could the earlier ones be studied and understood.¹ Therefore it is worthwhile now to look into the works of the earlier grammarians without the dogma-coloured spectacles of their successors. Since an edition of the Book of Sibawaih was published over eighty years ago,² where all the essentials of the language are already codified, it seems appropriate to start with the author of the *Kitāb*.³

The two chapters of the *Kitāb* in which Sibawaih is dealing with the D stem are 444: باب افتراق فعلت وأفعلت للمعنى and 445: باب دخول فَعَلْتُ على فَعَلْتُ لا يشركه في ذلك أفعلت.⁴ Chapter 444, which according to the title deals with the difference between the G and H stem as to meaning, actually also treats of the D stem in so far as its meaning resembles the meaning of H. So for Sibawaih there are, where meaning is concerned, two groups of D stems: one with an H-like meaning and the other with a G-like meaning.⁶

It is at least striking that Sibawaih does not mention an agreement of form and meaning like Ibn Ġinnī (see above) or say that the dominant meaning of D is the one expressing plurality as az-Zamahšarī did.⁷ The reason for this seems to be Sibawaih's awareness of the facts of the language. In the Qur'ān and in

¹ Cf. G. Jahn, *Sibawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik* (Berlin, 1895–1900, reprint Hildesheim, 1969), I, vii of the *Vorwort*.

² *Le livre de Sibawaihi, texte arabe publié par H. Derenbourg* (Paris, 1881–9, 2 vols., reprinted Hildesheim, 1970). Of course it should be borne in mind that even the second edition of the most influential European grammar of Arabic, Wright's grammar, was published in 1874, long before Derenbourg's edition of the *Kitāb*.

³ "Il reste...à dégager la grammaire arabe de toute cette construction artificielle et arbitraire, à reprendre son étude sur ses bases mêmes suivant son type linguistique; et pour les sources arabes, il faut faire grand cas du *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi où tout l'essentiel de la langue est déjà codifié sans la superfétation des spéculations subséquentes" (Fleisch, *op. cit.* p. 16).

⁴ In Derenbourg's edition, II, 247–51. In the Būlāq edition of 1316 A.H., of which a new impression was published in Baghdad, II, 233–7. In the following quotations first the place in the Būlāq edition will be mentioned, then the place in Derenbourg's edition.

⁵ II, 237–8/II, 251–2.

⁶ It seems to be more than sheer coincidence that Jenni in his study of the Hebrew D stem makes the same division. See Jenni, *op. cit.* p. 19, and the first section of the main part (pp. 20–123), where factitive D is differentiated from causative H and the second section of the main part (pp. 123–229), where resultative D is differentiated from G as "Aktualis".

⁷ Az-Zamahšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, ed. J. P. Broch (Oslo, 1859), p. 129.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

ancient poetry, as well as in the usage of the 'Arab, many examples of the same apparent meaning of D and H or of D and G of a given root are found. Sibawaih gives the impression that he is especially concerned about the usage of the 'Arab, as can be deduced from remarks like: ¹وسمعا من العرب من يقول: وقال بعض العرب ²وقال بعض العرب ³وبعض العرب يجرى ... مجرى ... or ... ويقال or وقالوا and frequently simply ⁴etc. It is in this light that his statements on the meaning of D are to be considered. Even where he clearly states his preference he does not dismiss data that do not harmonize with it as faulty. So he explicitly says, for example, that instead of ⁵غَلَّقَتِ الابواب غَلَّقَتِ ابواب can be used and that it is good Arabic, or that the use of G instead of D in the cases where it denotes plurality is permitted and that it is good Arabic.⁶

Interesting, because it shows his way of categorizing, is his explanation of why G can be used instead of D and why he thinks the use of D to be better in those cases. He says that just as the meaning of the *nomina speciei* like ⁷رَكْبَةٌ and ⁸جَلْسَةٌ may be included in the meaning of the verbal nouns like ⁹رُكُوبٌ and ¹⁰جُلُوسٌ the meaning of D denoting plurality may be included in the meaning of G, but that the special form is for the special meaning and therefore better.⁷ From such remarks it becomes clear that Sibawaih's treatment of grammatical problems is not merely descriptive; it is essentially a normative approach based on a solid theory, but like his teacher al-Halil he attaches great importance to the living language of the 'Arab⁸ and he is not forcing the material at his

¹ II, 233, ll. 24, 25/II, 248, l. 2.

² II, 234, ll. 18, 19/II, 248, l. 23.

³ II, 26, ll. 25-27, l. 1/II, 251, ll. 3, 4.

⁴ Illustrative of his attitude is the story of Sibawaih feeling bitterly disappointed, when al-Kisā'i had beaten him in a grammatical contest by producing a bribed informant, as later became clear. See *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, 1st edn. art. "Sibawaih".

⁵ II, 237, ll. 8, 9/II, 251, ll. 12, 13. As *šāhid* he quotes in the following line a verse of al-Farazdaq:

ما زِلْتُ أَغْلِقُ أَبْوَاباً وَأَفْتَحُهَا حَتَّى أَتَيْتُ أَبَا عَمْرٍو بْنَ عَمَّارٍ

⁶ II, 237, ll. 18, 19/II, 252, l. 2.

⁷ II, 237, ll. 19-22/II, 252, ll. 2-6. In the following line he quotes a variant of the verse mentioned in n. 6 above.

ما زِلْتُ أَفْتَحُ أَبْوَاباً وَأَغْلِقُهَا حَتَّى أَتَيْتُ أَبَا عَمْرٍو بْنَ عَمَّارٍ

and says that ⁸فَتَحَتْ would be better. See also p. 254, n. 2 below.

⁸ "Beide zitieren den Koran und beide berufen sich auf die Dichtung, ohne sich dabei auf eine bestimmte Zeit (Gāhiliya) oder bestimmte Sprecher

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

disposal¹ into his theoretical model of the language as did the later grammarians; or at least to a lesser extent.

Because of this as yet comparatively undogmatic approach a critical examination of Sībawaih's treatment of the D stem, and especially also of the examples which he supplies, may provide us with information that is at least less biased than that of later grammarians. Hence in the following exposition an attempt will be made to analyse the two chapters of the *Kitāb* dealing with the D stem. As the most practical procedure seems to be to follow Sībawaih in his arrangement, first chapter 444 and then chapter 445 will be looked at.

CHAPTER 444 (G ≠ D ≈ H)

There are a few general statements in this chapter from which it can be deduced that Sībawaih holds the view that D and H can have the same functions. Although there are other, more *ad hoc* observations about the D stem, these statements seem to be the essence of Sībawaih's views on those D stems which appear to have meanings belonging to the category that he has assigned to the H stem. Thus he writes:

(a) With most verbs it happens that, when you want to indicate that someone else induces the subject of G to (do or be) what G expresses, H is used.²

(b) D can also be used; it corresponds then to H, as D and H also can correspond in other cases.³

(c) D and H can occur with one meaning which they both (Beduinen) zu beschränken. Sie verwenden die gleichen Mittel der Interpretation. Ihnen ist bekannt, daß die Dichtersprache von der Alltagssprache verschieden ist. Mit Bezug auf die erstere operieren sie oft mit den Begriffen des Reim- und Verszwangs. Die wichtigste Sprachquelle für beide ist aber die gesprochene Rede der Beduinen, wie die zahlreichen Berufungen auf diese beweisen", etc. W. Reuschel, *Al-Ḥalīl Ibn-Aḥmad, der Lehrer Sībawaihs, als Grammatiker* (Berlin, 1959), p. 63.

¹ See e.g. also A. Bloch, "The Vowels of the Imperfect Preformatives in the Old Dialects of Arabic", *Z.D.M.G.* CXVII (1967), 22–9.

² II, 233, ll. 21, 22/II, 247, ll. 18, 19: فَاكْثَرُ مَا يَكُونُ عَلَى فَعَلٍ إِذَا أَرَدْتَ
أَنْ يَفْعَلَ مِنْهُ عَلَى أَفْعَلَتْ

³ II, 233, ll. 22, 23/II, 247, ll. 20–248, l. 1: وَقَدْ يَجِيءُ الشَّيْءُ عَلَى فَعَّلَتْ فَيَشْرَكَ
أَفْعَلَتْ كَمَا أَنَّهُمَا قَدْ يَشْتَرِكَانِ فِي غَيْرِ هَذَا

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

have, as [seems obvious, because] one induces someone (or something) else to be the logical subject.¹

(d) They can also occur with separate meanings.²

When put together these statements of Sibawaih mean: one of the functions of D³ is the same as that function of H, which is transitivizing G. This results in two main series of D meanings in this group:

I D and H of a given verb have the same meaning.

II D and H of a given verb have separate meanings, although D's meaning resembles an H-like meaning.

However important these statements may be, because they show what sort of conclusions Sibawaih drew from the available data, more important are the examples which he adduces as proof of his statements, for they lend themselves to further analysis. Although not all the examples are mentioned in immediate relation to the previous statements, they can safely be related to one of the two meaning-series.

I D AND H HAVE THE SAME MEANING

- 1 فرح G to be glad, happy. D = H to make happy; to gladden.⁴
- 2 غرم G to be guilty; to pay a fine. D = H to fine; to impose a fine.
- 3 فزع G to be afraid. D = H to make afraid; to frighten.
- 4 ملح G to be salt(y). D = H to salt.
- 5 ظرف G to be nice, elegant. D = H to make nice; to embellish.
- 6 نبل G to be noble, superior. D = H to make noble, superior.⁵

¹ II, 236, ll. 22, 23/II, 251, ll. 22–252, l. 1: وقد يجيء فَعَّلْتُ وَأَفْعَلْتُ في معنى واحد مشتركين كما جاء فيما صيرته فاعلا. This somewhat obscure place is explained by Sirāfi as كما اشتركا في باب نقل الفاعل الى المفعول. See Jahn, *Sibawaihi's 'Buch über die Grammatik'*, II, 2, 329–30. Jahn proposes the conjecture فيهما instead of فيهما on the basis of Sirāfi's reading فيه and gives as general meaning: "Derjenige, welcher in der 1. F. فاعل ist, wird in der 2. u. 4. F. dazu gemacht."

² II, 236, l. 25/II, 252, l. 2: وقد يجيئان مفترقين.

³ The other being to express plurality, لتكثير, see chapter 445.

⁴ Examples 1–9 on II, 233, l. 22–236, l. 3/II, 248, ll. 1–6 follow statement (b).

⁵ The vowelling نَبَل leads to the supposition that the mentioned meaning is the one intended. However, in the *Lisān* D and H of نَبَل are not mentioned. Of course, the vowelling can be wrong, and نَبَل G to shoot arrows, D = H to give arrows for shooting, may be meant. See also LA (= Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, ed. Beyrouth, 1968), XI, 643.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

- 7 نزل G to dismount; to go down. D = H to make dismount;
to send down.¹
- 8 كثر G to be much. D = H to make much.
- 9 قلّ G to be few. D = H to make few.²
- 10 عار G to be one-eyed. D = H to make one-eyed.³
- 11 ساد G to be black. D = H to make black.⁴
- 12 وعز (G) to instruct; to suggest. D = H = (G).⁵
- 13 خبر (G) to experience; to know well. D = H to let know; to
notify.⁶
- 14 سمى (G) to give a name; to call. D = H = (G).⁷
- 15 غلق (G) to be closed, shut. D = H to close; to shut.
- 16 جال (G) to be good; to act well. D = H to do something
well.⁸

¹ On II, 237, l. 11/II, 251, ll. 15, 16 Sibawaih mentions that Abū 'Amr used to differentiate between D and H. The *Lisān*, XI, 656, mentions this remark but adds that the differentiation is not mentioned, but Abū'l-Ḥasan is quoted:

لا فرق عندي بين نَزَلْتُ وأنزَلْتُ إلا صيغة التثنية في نَزَلْتُ

² On II, 237, ll. 2-5/II, 251, ll. 5-8 Sibawaih differentiates between D and H of both verbs: D to make little or much, H to bring little or much. But he also adds *وَقَوْلِي أَقَلَّتْ وَأَكْثَرَتْ أَيْضًا فِي مَعْنَى قَلَّتْ وَكَثُرَتْ*. The *Lisān* gives the same distinction, while in both cases also the view that D = H is put forward. See for *كثر* LA, v, 132 and for *قلّ* LA, XI, 563. Cf. Ibn Qutaiba, *Adab al-Kātib*, ed. Leiden, pp. 378, 379, ed. Cairo, p. 274, where the same distinction is made. See also p. 247, n. 6 below.

³ Examples 10 and 11 on II, 234, ll. 18-20/II, 248, ll. 23-249, l. 1 are by Sibawaih himself and are connected with statement (b).

⁴ H is not explicitly mentioned, but it would seem from the context that Sibawaih meant to say that D has the same meaning as H of this verb.

⁵ Examples 12, 13 and 14 on II, 236, ll. 23, 24/II, 251, ll. 1, 2 follow after statement (c). Sibawaih does not mention G of these three examples. For *وعز* see also LA, v, 429, 430, where Ibn as-Sikkīt and al-Aṣma'ī (and against them al-Ġauharī) are mentioned as disapproving the use of G.

⁶ See also LA, IV, 227, where D = H = نَبَأَ.

⁷ See also LA, XIV, 402, where D = H, but according to al-Ġauharī: D + 2 acc. = H + acc. + ب.

⁸ Examples 15 and 16 on II, 237, ll. 8-11/II, 251, ll. 12-15 are among a few last remarks of chapter 444, that form a kind of transition to the next chapter. Sibawaih does not mention G of these two examples. Although he says that *غلق* D is used *حين كثروا العمل*, he admits that H can also be used then (*ṣāhid*: the verse quoted above, p. 243, n. 5) and is good Arabic. For the meaning of *غلق* G see LA, x, 291: *غَلَقَ الْبَابَ وَأَغْلَقَهُ وَغَلَقَهُ الْأُولَى عَنْ ابْنِ دُرَيْدٍ عَزَاهَا*. For the meaning of *غَلَقَ* G see LA, x, 291: *غَلَقَ الْبَابَ وَأَغْلَقَهُ وَغَلَقَهُ الْأُولَى عَنْ ابْنِ دُرَيْدٍ عَزَاهَا*. For the meaning of *غَلَقَ* G see LA, x, 291: *غَلَقَ الْبَابَ وَأَغْلَقَهُ وَغَلَقَهُ الْأُولَى عَنْ ابْنِ دُرَيْدٍ عَزَاهَا*.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

II D AND H HAVE SEPARATE MEANINGS

D and H are both mentioned

(a) *D habitual action of subject, H occasional action of subject*¹

17 علم (G) to be aware; to know. D to teach; to instruct. H to let know; to inform.²

18 أذن (G) to listen. D to make an announcement (of a herald). H to let know; to inform.³

19 مرض (G) to be ill. D to nurse; to tend, H to render ill.⁴

(b) *D privative, H normal causative*

20 قذى (G) to be dirty (eye). D to clean (the eye) from dirt. H to render (the eye) dirty.⁵

(c) *D accidental action towards object, H substantial action towards object*

21 كثر (G) to be much. D to make much. H to increase; to augment.

22 قل (G) to be few. D to make few. H to decrease; to reduce.⁶

ومثل غَلَقْتُ وَأَغْلَقْتُ أَجَدْتُ وَجَدْتُ وَاشْبَاهَهُ Sibawaih simply adds جاد

For the meaning of جاد G see LA, III, 135: صار: جَادَ الشَّيْءُ جُودَةً وَجُودَةً أَيْ صَارَ جَيِّدًا.

¹ The habitual action of D is most clearly seen in the participle, which has often a professional force.

² Examples 17–25 on II, 236, ll. 24–237, l. 7/II, 251, ll. 2–10 follow after statement (d). Of these ten examples Sibawaih does not mention G. Of علم he says: D = أَدَّبَ, H = آذَنَ. See also LA, XII, 417.

³ Sibawaih explains وَأَذَنْتُ أَعْلَمْتُ وَأَذَنْتُ النَّدَاءُ وَالتَّصْوِيتُ بِإِعْلَانٍ, but adds that some Arabs treat D and H in the same way as D and H of سَمِيَ (no. 14), i.e. as having the same meaning.

⁴ Sibawaih: وَتَقُولُ أَمْرَضْتُهُ أَيْ جَعَلْتُهُ مَرِيضًا وَمَرَضْتُهُ أَيْ قَمْتُ عَلَيْهِ وَوَلِيْتُهُ.

⁵ Sibawaih: أَقْدَيْتُ عَيْنَهُ أَيْ جَعَلْتُهَا قَذِيَّةً وَقَدَيْتُهَا نَظْفَتْهَا.

⁶ Sibawaih: وَتَقُولُ أَكْثَرَ اللَّهُ فِينَا بِمَثَلِكِ أَيْ أَدْخَلَ اللَّهُ فِينَا كَثِيرًا بِمَثَلِكِ وَتَقُولُ لِلرَّجُلِ أَكْثَرْتُ أَيْ جِئْتُ بِالْكَثِيرِ وَأَمَّا كَثَرْتُ فَأَنْ تَجْعَلَ قَلِيلًا كَثِيرًا وَكَذَلِكَ قَلَلْتُ وَكَثَرْتُ

قَلَّ H: جاء بقليل, but also of both verbs: D = H, see p. 246, n. 2. Cf. Qur'an, vii, 86: قَالُوا يَنْوُحُ: 32 وَادْكُرُوا إِذْ كُنْتُمْ قَلِيلًا فَكَثَّرَكُمْ. الَّذِينَ طَعُوا فِي الْبِلَادِ قَاءً كَثُرُوا فِيهَا: 12, 11, 12 and لَقَدْ جَدُّ لَنَا قَاءً كَثُرَتْ جِدَالُنَا الْفَسَادِ.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

(d) *D non-durative, H durative*

- 23 **صبح** D to come (to someone) in the morning. H to be in the morning.
 24 **مسي** D to come (to someone) in the evening. H to be in the evening.
 25 **سحر** D to come (to someone) at daybreak. H to be at daybreak.
 26 **بات** D to come (to someone) at night.¹

(e) *D transitive, H in(ternal-)transitive*²

- 27 **فطر** (G) to split; to break (the fast). D to make (someone) a fastbreaker. H to break the fast.
 28 **بشر** (G) to rejoice; to be happy. D to make (someone) a rejoicer. H to rejoice.³
 29 **عسر** (G) to be difficult. D to straiten; to make poor. H to be straitened, poor.
 30 **يسر** (G) to be easy. D to ease; to enrich. H to be in easy circumstances, rich.⁴

وتقول أَصْبَحْنَا وَأَمْسَيْنَا وَاسْحَرْنَا وَأَفْجَرْنَا وَذَلِكَ إِذَا صَرْتَ فِي حِينٍ صُبْحٍ
 وَمَسَاءٍ وَسَحَرٍ وَأَمَّا صَبَّحْنَا وَمَسَيْنَا وَسَحَرْنَا فَتَقُولُ اتَيْنَاهُ صَبَاحًا وَمَسَاءً وَسَحَرًا
 وَمِثْلُهُ بَلَّغْنَا اتَيْنَاهُ بَيَاتًا

For the non-durative D over against the durative H cf. Qur'ān, liv, 38:
 فَسَبِّحْهُنَّ اللَّيْلَ: 17: وَلَقَدْ صَبَّحَهُنَّ بَكْرَةً عَذَابٌ مُسْتَقَرٌّ
 حِينَ تُمْسُونَ وَحِينَ تُصْبِحُونَ. Because the G meanings of these denominative
 verbs do not bear upon the meanings of D and H, G is here not listed for
 examples 23–6.

² See, amongst other places, for the internal-transitive H, G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1929, reprinted Hildesheim, 1962), II, 102, 103 and Jenni, *op. cit.* pp. 46–50. Cf. also Wright, *op. cit.* I, 34, rem. (c).

³ Examples 27 and 28 on II, 235, ll. 2, 3/II, 249, ll. 4, 5. About D of these verbs Sibawaih says: وَقَدْ جَاءَ فَعَلْتَهُ إِذَا أَرَدْتَ أَنْ تَجْعَلَهُ مُفْعَلًا and adds after citing the two examples: وَهَذَا النُّحُو قَلِيلٌ.

⁴ Examples 29 and 30 on II, 236, ll. 9–11/II, 250, ll. 8–10: **عسر** D = ضَيِّقَ عَلَى; ومثل المَجْرِبِ والمَقْطِفِ. About H of both verbs he says: **يسر** D = وَسَّحَ عَلَى. Hand **جرب** H being explained on II, 235, ll. 15–18/II, 249, ll. 17–20 as meaning respectively صار صاحب جَرَبٍ فِي مَالِهِ and صار صاحب قِطَافٍ فِي مَالِهِ.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

Only D is mentioned¹

(f) *D declarative-estimative*

- 31 خطيء (G) to be wrong; to sin. D to call (someone) a sinner.
 32 فسق (G) to trespass. D to call (someone) a trespasser.
 33 زنى (G) to commit adultery. D to call (someone) an adulterer.
 34 لحن (G) to speak incorrectly. D to call (someone) an incorrect speaker.²
 35 شجع (G) to be(come) brave. D^p to be considered brave.
 36 جبن (G) to be(come) a coward. D^p to be considered a coward.
 37 قوى (G) to be(come) strong. D^p to be considered strong.³
 38 شنع (G) to be(come) abominable. D^p to be considered (and said to be) abominable.⁴

(g) *D delocutive*⁵

- 39 حيى D to say (to someone): حيّاك الله may God keep you alive.
 40 سقى D to say (to someone): سقاك الله may God give you to drink.
 41 رعى D to say (to someone): رعاك الله may God keep you.
 42 جدع D to say (to someone): جدعك الله may God mutilate you.
 43 عقر D to say (to someone): عقرك الله may God wound you.
 44 آف D to say (to someone): آف بك shame upon you.⁶

¹ It is not surprising that of the two following verbs Sibawaih does not mention H, because H of these verbs either does not occur or is in(ternal-)transitive or normal causative; thus there is no need to contrast H explicitly with the declarative-estimative or delocutive D.

² Examples 31–4 on II, 235, ll. 3–6/II, 249, ll. 5–8 are explained as سَمِيْتَهُ etc. See also below, n. 6.

³ Examples 35–7 on II, 237, l. 7/II, 251, ll. 10, 11 are given only in the passive. They are explained as: وما بُنى على يفعل يشجع يجبن ويقوى أى يرمى بذلك.

⁴ Example 38 on II, 237, ll. 7, 8/II, 251, ll. 11, 12 follows immediately after the three preceding ones: ومثله قد شنع الرجل أى رمى بذلك وقيل له. The Būlāq edition reads شنع instead of شنع.

⁵ The term delocutive, which was coined by E. Benveniste (see D. R. Hillers, "Delocutive verbs in biblical Hebrew", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVI (1967), 320–4), is used to denote verbs that are derived from a locution, e.g. كبر to say كبر الله. Because of the very fact that the following verbs are derived from locutions, there will be no need to mention G of these verbs.

⁶ Examples 39–44 on II, 235, ll. 4–7/II, 249 ll. 6–9 are explained by Sibawaih with . . . أى استقبلته . . . (only حَيَّيْتَهُ) or . . . قلت له (the other examples)

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

The first thing to be observed is the conspicuous absence of such remarks as that D, when its meaning is (nearly) synonymous with that of H, always keeps a shade of intensity.¹ Only in connection with example 15, which occurs in the last lines of this chapter, is something said about plurality of action denoted by D, but even there the remark is counterbalanced by the observation that then also the use of H is good Arabic, and a *ṣāhid* verse is quoted that shows H of the same verb with the object in the plural.²

If it is not intensity which marks the difference between D and H, when they have a similar or seemingly identical meaning, what then is it that distinguishes their meanings in those cases at least where they can clearly be differentiated, notwithstanding their similarity?

The implicit answer of Sibawaih seems to be that they are only different, more or less well-defined groups, but that does not necessarily mean that a common denominator cannot be found. Since clues for finding one have been offered from Akkadian and Hebrew grammar, a closer look at Sibawaih's examples may reveal this common denominator. To indicate that D's meaning is distinct from that of H, the term factitive³ as distinct from and the mentioned locutions. It is to be noted that *فَسَقُ* D and *خَطِي* D are not only explained as declaratives but also as *فَاسَقُ* and *يَا فَاسَقُ*, i.e. as delocutives. It seems that it is not always possible to draw a strict dividing line between declaratives and delocutives. Also connected with the delocutives is *لَحَن* D. On 11, 235, ll. 7–10/11, 249, ll. 9–12, Sibawaih adds that H is also said to be used as a delocutive and gives *سَقَى* H as an example. However in the *ṣāhid* verses of *Dū ar-Rumma*:

وَقَفْتُ عَلَى رُبْعٍ لَمِيَّةٍ نَاقَتِي فَمَا زِلْتُ أَبْكِي حَوْلَهُ وَأَخَاطِبُهُ
وَأَسْقِيهِ حَتَّى كَادَ مِمَّا أَتَشَّه تُكَلِّمُنِي أَحْجَارُهُ وَمَلَاعِبُهُ

أَسْقِيَهُ could, on account of the parallelism, also be explained as “and I watered it” i.e. “wetted it with my tears”.

¹ See above, p. 241, n. 5.

² See above, p. 243, nn. 5, 7, and p. 246, n. 8.

³ This is perhaps a somewhat unfortunate term, because factitive has been used as practically synonymous with causative, e.g. by Chouémi, *op. cit.* p. 128. Cf. *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1947), p. 667: “Factitive: ...a. Of a verb: Expressing the notion of making a thing to be of a certain character in deed, word, or thought; taking a complementary object. b. Causative.”

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

causative has been introduced. Hence the term factitive indicates the effectuation of a state or condition, and causative the bringing about of a process or action.

In E. Jenni's book about the Hebrew D-stem, this difference is further operationalized by establishing sets of semantic oppositions between D and H. In this way there are revealed the differences that exist between D and H with regard to:

- (1) The relation between subject and object of the action.
- (2) The action itself.
- (3) The relation between subject and action.
- (4) The relation between action and object.¹

It would be carrying things too far to enumerate in detail all the niceties of differentiation, especially as Jenni's work deals with Hebrew and not with Arabic, and also because, though it may be expected that D in both languages will have a basically similar function, the way wherein that function is applied will almost certainly be different.

The differences found for Hebrew are:

ad 1. D expresses the transferring of the object, without any cooperation of its own, into a new state or condition, whereas in the case of H the object at the same time remains the logical subject of the process or action (as expressed by G).²

ad 2. In D a momentary or non-durative, but in H a durative type of action is shown.³

ad 3. The subject of D acts habitually, whereas the subject of H act occasionally.⁴

ad 4. In D the action towards the object is accidental, but in H it is substantial.⁵

These subdifferentiations are complementary, but dependent on the context and the meaning of G; one of them will be more conspicuously applicable.

It will be clear at first sight that some of the subdivisions of series II are characterized by some of the subdifferentiations of factitive and causative as found by Jenni, e.g. II*a* by subdifferentiation 3, II*c* by subdifferentiation 4 and II*d* by subdifferentiation 2. Also a privative meaning of D falls clearly within Jenni's

¹ Jenni, *op. cit.* pp. 33, 34.

² Jenni, *op. cit.* Hauptteil I, 3: Bewirken und Veranlassen, pp. 33–52.

³ Jenni, *op. cit.* Hauptteil I, 4: Aktionsarten der Handlung, pp. 52–77.

⁴ Jenni, *op. cit.* Hauptteil I, 5: Habituelle und okkasionelle Handlung des Subjekts, pp. 77–87.

⁵ Jenni, *op. cit.* Hauptteil I, 6: Akzidentielle und substantielle Beziehung der Handlung zum Objekt, pp. 87–112.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

definition of the factitive: it denotes that by taking away something the object is transferred into a new state or condition,¹ so subdifferentiation 1 is applicable to II*b*. Also, subdifferentiation 1 is applicable to subdivision II*e*,² because D shows the effectuation of a condition and the logical subject of H is the same as the grammatical subject.

The matter of the declarative estimatives and delocutives (II*f* and *g*) deserves some special attention. Jenni argues³ that the declarative (declaring that someone is in a certain state or condition) and the estimative (presuming that someone is in a certain state or condition) meanings of D always imply that a subjective opinion or judgment in relation to a not generally perceived, abstract quality is being stated, it being immaterial how the opinion is arrived at. As such it expresses a special case of the relation between subject and object as stated in subdifferentiation 1, the particularity being only a difference of the manner wherein the pronounced state or condition is valid.⁴ From this argument it follows that a declarative H in the same sense as the declarative D cannot exist [in Hebrew]. When H seems to have a declarative meaning it expresses not a subjective judgment, but an established reality.⁵

It is striking that Sibawaih comes to a similar conclusion when he speaks about the “declarative” H: فإما أحمدته فتقول وجدته: ⁶مستحقاً للحمد منى وبذلك استبنت انه استحق الحمد... or in other words,

¹ See also Jenni, *op. cit.* p. 273.

² Of course, one of the other subdifferentiations may also be applicable, e.g. 3 to بشر D “to evangelize, to preach”. A مُبَشِّر is therefore someone who habitually (professionally) preaches a gospel; cf. above, p. 247, n. i.

³ Jenni, *op. cit.* pp. 40–3.

⁴ “Der von uns empfundene Unterschied zwischen faktitiv und deklarativ-ästimativ beruht letztlich nur auf einem Unterschied in der Geltungsweise des erreichten adjektivisch ausgesagten Zustandes. Ist der als Ergebnis der Stellungnahme zu einem Phänomen ausgesagte Zustand als allgemein einsichtig vorgestellt, so entspricht ihm das Pi‘el in faktitiver Bedeutung; ist der Zustand das Ergebnis einer subjektiven Stellungnahme (weil ein allgemein einsichtige Beurteilung der Sache gar nicht möglich ist), so entspricht ihm das Pi‘el in deklarativ-ästimativer Bedeutung”, Jenni, *op. cit.* p. 42.

⁵ Jenni, *op. cit.* pp. 43–5. Jenni’s denial of the existence (in Hebrew) of a declarative H with the same meaning as the declarative D is criticized in W. T. Claassen, “The declarative-estimative Hiph‘il”, *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 11 (1972), 5–16.

⁶ II, 236, ll. 4–6/II, 250, ll. 3–4. See for حمد H also LA, III, 156. Cf. LA, XI, 47, s.v. بخل:

ويخله : رماه بالبخل ونسبه إلى البخل . وأبخله : وجده بخيلاً

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

the action expressed by *حمد* H is object-adequate.¹ As the de-locutives mentioned appear to indicate that, in the form of a wish or malediction,² a subjective opinion or judgment is expressed about the object, it seems appropriate to consider both II*f* and II*g* as special cases of subdifferentiation 1.

In addition to the likelihood that the discrimination between the factitive and causative categories as found for Hebrew can be useful to distinguish D from H in Arabic, it is illustrative that Jenni's starting-point (namely that from an intransitive G a factitive D is to be expected) seems also to be applicable to Arabic. Of the examples of a factitive D that are not derived from a noun or locution (II*d* and *g*), all except one (no. 27) of the D verbs of series II can be connected with an intransitive G.

Of course, the assertion that D has a denominative value, as one often reads, is rather meaningless; the same can be said of other verbal stems. It is necessary to examine if the denominative D verbs fall into the same category as the other D verbs. For examples 23–6 (II*d*), and possibly also 27, this seems to be the case.

The mere possibility of differentiating Sibawaih's examples of series II in terms of factitive and causative leads to the supposition that it may be possible to differentiate the examples of series I in a like manner. The problem, however, is that Sibawaih does not provide further explanation and information about these verbs. Yet apart from the fact that the verbs *كثر* and *قل* are mentioned in both series, an indication can be found in the fact that nearly all the verbs mentioned in series I have an intransitive G. Of course, it is also possible that already in Sibawaih's time a semantic overlap of D and H, as later seems to be the case, can be established.

CHAPTER 445 ($G \approx D \neq H$)

In this relatively short chapter those verbs are treated that have no similarity of meaning in D and H, but have a similar meaning in D and G. For Sibawaih this seems to be a clear-cut case. He

¹ Of course, this decides nothing for the situation in Hebrew, though it gives some support to Jenni's view.

² Reckendorf, *op. cit.* p. 55, says that the perfect in this kind of locution is a "Form der Gewißheit" and Wright, *op. cit.* II, 3 (concerning *رَحِمَهُ اللهُ* etc.) says, "The proper signification of the perfect in this case is, 'if it be as I wish, God has already had mercy on him' &c." Cf. K. Aartun, *Zur Frage altarabischer Tempora* (Oslo, 1963), pp. 74–9.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

assigns all the D stems that are more or less synonymous with their G stems to one category. It is no wonder then that not many examples are adduced; just a few serve to illustrate the point.

His rather unequivocal view can be summarized as follows:

(a) D is to be distinguished from G as denoting plurality of action.¹

(b) Although G can be used instead of D, when it denotes plurality of action (because a notion of plurality can be included in a G meaning), D is the special form for it.²

III *D and G have the same meaning, but D expresses also plurality*

- 45 كسر G to break. D to break into many pieces.
 46 قطع G to cut. D to cut into many pieces.
 47 مزق (G) to tear. D to tear to many pieces.³
 48 علط G to brand (one camel). D to brand (many camels).
 49 جرح G to wound. D to wound many or to afflict with many wounds.⁴
 50 فرس (G) to seize and crush. D to seize and crush many.
 51 أكل (G) to eat. D to eat many.⁵
 52 مات (G) to die. D to die (of many).
 53 قام (G) to get up. D to get up (of many).⁶

¹ II, 237, ll. 14, 15/II, 251, ll. 18, 19:

تقول كَسَرْتُهَا وَقَطَعْتُهَا فَإِذَا أَرَدْتَ كَثْرَةَ الْعَمَلِ قُلْتَ كَسَرْتُهُ وَقَطَعْتُهُ وَمَزَقْتُهُ

The examples show that in plurality of action, plurality of object or subject is also included.

² II, 237, ll. 19–22/II, 252, ll. 2–6:

وَأَعْلِمُ أَنَّ التَّخْفِيفَ فِي هَذَا جَائِزٌ كُلُّهُ عَرَبِيٌّ إِلَّا أَنَّ قَعَلْتُ إِدْخَالَهَا هَاهُنَا لَتَبَيِّنَ الْكَثِيرَ وَقَدْ يَدْخُلُ فِي هَذَا التَّخْفِيفِ كَمَا أَنَّ الرِّكْبَةَ وَالْجِلْسَةَ قَدْ يَكُونُ مَعْنَاهُمَا فِي الرُّكُوبِ وَالْجُلُوسِ . . . فَصَارَ بِنَاءً خَاصًّا كَمَا أَنَّ هَذَا بِنَاءٌ خَاصًّا لِلتَّكْثِيرِ . . .

See also above, p. 243, n. 7.

³ Examples 45–55 on II, 237, ll. 14–18/II, 251, l. 18–252, l. 2. See for examples 45–7, above, n. 1.

⁴ Sibawaih: (كثرة العمل) قولهم غَلَطْتُ الْبَعِيرَ وَإِبِلٌ مَعْلَطَةٌ وَبَعِيرٌ مَعْلُوطٌ وَجَرَحْتُهُ وَجَرَحَتْهُمْ وَجَرَحَتْهُ أَكْثَرُ الْجِرَاحَاتِ فِي جَسَدِهِ

⁵ Sibawaih: وَقَالُوا ظَلَّ يَفْرِسُهَا السَّبُعُ يُؤْكَلُهَا إِذَا أَكْثَرَ ذَلِكَ فِيهَا

⁶ Sibawaih: وَقَالُوا مَوَّتَتْ وَقَوَّتْ أَرَدَتْ جَمَاعَةَ الْإِبِلِ وَغَيْرِهَا. These seem to be very specialized meanings of مات D and قام D. The more usual ones are,

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

- 54 جال (G) to go about; to roam. D to go about much; to roam much.
 55 طاف (G) to go about; to circumambulate. D to go about much; to circumambulate much.¹
 56 فتح (G) to open. D to open many (doors).
 57 فجر (G) to split; to cleave. D to split many; to cleave many (wells).²

The examples supplied by Sibawaih make clear his view that, in the case of similar D and G meanings, the differentiation can easily be made, the common denominator of those Ds being plurality. Because of the brevity of this chapter, the categorical statements, the relative scarcity of examples and the schematic explanation of those examples, only a few observations can be made:

(1) Sibawaih does not mention an intensive or iterative force distinguishing D from G.

(2) The conclusions and examples of Sibawaih do not seem to contradict Jenni's findings for Hebrew (except perhaps nos. 52 and 53) that when G is transitive, D is resultative, because the state or condition effectuated is the *result* of an action as denoted in G.³ Action to further objects and successive movements are shown by Jenni to be some of the several types of the resultative.⁴

(3) Later grammarians elaborated on Sibawaih's rather succinct statements in this chapter and gave as their view that D was also للمبالغة or للتكرير

as to be expected from the intransitive Gs, factitive. Interesting is the explanation in the *Lisān*, XII, 501, of this قام D: قَوَّمت الغنم means "to be afflicted by القُوام, an illness of the legs that makes the animals stand up".

¹ Sibawaih: وقالوا يُجَوِّلُ اى يُكْثِرُ الجَوْلانَ وَيُطَوِّفُ اى يُكْثِرُ التَّطَوِّيفَ.

² Examples 56 and 57 on II, 237, l. 23–238, l. 2/II, 252, ll. 7–9 are only given in quotations. For the quotation from al-Farazdaq, see above, p. 243, n. 7. Two Qur'ān quotations are added, xxxviii, 50: جَنَاتٍ عَدْنٍ مُمْتَحَنَةٍ لَهُمْ and liv, 12: وَقَفَّجْنَا الارْضَ عَنُونًا. These last two examples should be contrasted with two other Qur'ān places: xxxix, 71, 73 (in I, 453, l. 22/I, 403, ll. 7, 8 used by Sibawaih himself, however with فَجَحَ D^b):

وَقَفَّجْنَا حَلالهما نَهْرًا: xviii, 33 and حتى اذا جاءوها وَفَّتَحَتْ أَبْوابُها.

³ Jenni considers a verb of which an accusative-object is logically conceivable (e.g. to go = to make a walk; to cry = to let out a cry) also as transitive. See Jenni's introductory part of D resultative *op. cit.* pp. 123–6.

⁴ Jenni, *op. cit.* pp. 145, 151 and 151–6.

SIBAWAIH'S TREATMENT OF THE D STEM

only valid in distinguishing D from G when necessary, but also in differentiating D from H when both have similar meanings.¹

CONCLUSION

Sibawaih's treatment of the D stem shows that for him it is certainly not an intensive stem. Rather, there are for him two kinds of D stems. One shows similarities with the H stem and the other with the G stem. No clear overall distinction between similar D and H is found by Sibawaih; he contents himself with a number of *ad hoc* differentiations. These *ad hoc* differentiations, however, seem to be nothing more than various manifestations of the difference between a factitive and a causative. Similarly, the characteristics that – according to Sibawaih – distinguish a D from a similar G seem to be manifestations of a resultative. Although Sibawaih seems to offer strong indications that the meaning of the D stem was a factitive-resultative one, it will be clear that conclusive evidence can be supplied only by research into a fairly extensive textual corpus. Because of its length, and also because a good concordance is available, the Qur'ān will be an excellent corpus to begin with.²

¹ See above, p. 241, nn. 4, 5.

² Provoked and stimulated by the book of Jenni and the remarks of Fleisch in his review of Chouémi, *Le verbe dans le Coran*, "...il fallait exposer ...les exemples manifestant des oppositions particulières entre des Formes... Ainsi: l'opposition d'une IIe et IVe F., factitives, mais pour des sens différents...; la spécialisation du factitif, dans ces IIe et IVe Formes...", in *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, XLIV (1968), 262, the present writer is engaged on a study of the D stem in the Qur'ān.